UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/539,252	06/15/2005	Minoru Shibazaki	1176/316	2428
46852 LIU & LIU	7590 04/01/200	8	EXAMINER	
444 S. FLOWE	R STREET, SUITE 17		RUDE, TIMOTHY L	
LOS ANGELES, CA 90071			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2871	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/01/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/539,252	SHIBAZAKI, MINORU				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	TIMOTHY RUDE	2871				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period variety or period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 Fe	ebruary 2008.					
·— · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	action is non-final.					
<del>'=</del>						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	•					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	d.				
Attachment(s)	_					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)     Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) ☐ Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P10-948)     Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal P					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6)					

Application/Control Number: 10/539,252 Page 2

Art Unit: 2871

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Invention I, claim(s) 1-7, drawn to an optical device.

Invention II, claim(s) 8-14, drawn to a method of making an optical device.

The inventions listed as Inventions I and II do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

The method does not necessarily produce the specific device, and the specific device does not require the specific steps of either species of the method (see claim 8 vs claim 13). Patentably distinct mutually exclusive features exist in each invention that do not exist in the other invention. Therefore, unity of invention cannot exist for said patentably distinct mutually exclusive features.

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The orthogonal species sets are as follows:

Species A, drawn to inclined surface features as illustrated in Figure 2.

Species B, drawn to inclined surface features as illustrated in Figure 10.

Species C, drawn to inclined surface features as illustrated in Figure 11.

Page 3

Species D, drawn to a first step of forming, in the one principal plane, a groove comprising an outline having at least one inclined plane associated with the light-utilizable area (see claim 8).

Species E, drawn to a first step (only step) of forming such a display mechanism construction including a display medium for forming an image on the other principal plane side of the optical collective substrate that the construction has pixels or predetermined displayed units corresponding to the light-utilizable areas (see claim 13).

Although examiner has made every effort to ensure this restriction requirement is complete, examiner reserves the right to further restrict as need be, depending upon Applicant's election and the course of prosecution.

Please note claim 13 (and maybe claim 8) may be considered indefinite under 112 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph due to the fact most limitations are structural (device limitations) as opposed to method steps (method of making limitations). Appropriate correction is recommended to expedite prosecution.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect Invention I <u>and</u> a single species from A-C <u>or</u> Invention II and a single species from D-E, to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. <u>The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently</u>

Art Unit: 2871

<u>added</u>. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above as cited above.

The following claim(s) are generic: none.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The species contain mutually exclusive features considered to be patentably distinct, so unity of invention for those mutually exclusive features cannot exist because said mutually exclusive features exist only in their respective species.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Page 5

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result

in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TIMOTHY RUDE whose telephone number is (571)272-2301. The examiner can normally be reached on Increased Flex Time Program.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nelms C. David can be reached on (571) 272-1787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

tlr

/TIMOTHY RUDE/ Examiner, Art Unit 2871